



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/500,208	02/08/2000	Katherine Betz	YO999-547	2257

7590 11/23/2004  
William E. Lewis  
Ryan & Mason LLP  
90 Forest Avenue  
Locust Valley, NY 11560

EXAMINER

OSMAN, RAMY M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2157

DATE MAILED: 11/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/500,208	BETZ ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Ramy M Osman	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/21/2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This is in response to RCE filed on 8/23/2004. Claims 1-25 are pending.

#### ***Specification***

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 11 lines 23-24, it is not clear whether the server is getting or checking the customer ID.
3. Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 1-6,8-10,12-18 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mitchell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,933).**

Mitchell teaches the invention as claimed including a method, a system and an article of manufacture for use in a client/server system of reducing interactions between a client and server

in association with an application being accessed by the client at the server (see Mitchell, column 1 lines 5-10 and column 2 lines 27-33).

6. In reference to claims 1,13 and 25, Mitchell teaches the above method, system and article of manufacture comprising the steps of:

Configuring the server to store a model associated with the application and to maintain view-generating and controller logic associated with the application (columns 2 lines 11-50 and column 4 lines 1-30 & 40-51)

Configuring the client to store at least a subset of the model associated with the application and to maintain at least a subset of the view-generating and controller logic associated with the application, wherein one or more portions of the application are performed at the client without the client having to interact with the server (columns 4 line 52 – column 5 line 30).

7. In reference to claim 2 and 14, Mitchell teaches the method and system of claims 1 and 13 respectively wherein the client and server communicate over a HyperText Transport Protocol network (columns 4 lines 15-40, HTTP is inherent for Internet communications).

8. In reference to claim 3 and 15, Mitchell teaches the method of claim 1 and 13 respectively wherein the client performs the one or more portions of the application in accordance with browser software running thereon (columns 3 lines 35-67).

9. In reference to claim 4 and 16, Mitchell teaches the the method and system of claim 3 and 15 respectively wherein the configuring step further comprises the step of partitioning a screen area associated with the browser software into frames (column 5 lines 50-67 and column 11 lines 15-40, Mitchell discloses multiple windows within an interface with a browser).

Art Unit: 2157

10. In reference to claim 8 and 20, Doyle teaches the the method and system of claim 4 and 16 respectively wherein the configuring step further comprises forming at least one frame with which application-independent view-generating logic and controller logic is associated (column 5 lines 50-67 and column 11 lines 15-40).

11. In reference to claim 9 and 21, Doyle teaches the the method and system of claim 8 and 20 respectively wherein the at least one application-independent view-generating logic and controller logic frame further has an application-independent model associated therewith (column 5 lines 50-67 and column 11 lines 15-40).

12. In reference to claim 12 and 24, Doyle teaches the the method and system of claim 1 and 13 respectively, wherein the at least a subset of the model, the view-generating and the controller logic associated with the application are downloaded from the server to the client upon demand (Abstract and column 3 lines 55-67).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. **Claims 7,11,19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,933) in view of Doyle et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,906).**

15. In reference to claim 5 and 17, Mitchell teaches the the method and system of claim 4 and 16 above. Mitchell fails to explicitly teach wherein the at least a subset of the model, the view-generating and the controller logic associated with the application are associated with at least one frame and one or more views for display in accordance with the application are associated with at least another frame.

However Doyle teaches a client accessing a portion of an application (document) from a server, with at least a subset of the program objects, the display and the control objects are all associated with at least one panel window. Doyle teaches wherein the at least a subset of the model, the view-generating and the controller logic associated with the application are associated with at least one frame and one or more views for display in accordance with the application are associated with at least another frame (Summary and columns 16 lines 9-40).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Mitchell by making at least a subset of the program objects, the display and the control objects are all associated with at least one panel window as per the teachings of Doyle for accessing a portion of an application (document) from a server.

16. In reference to claim 6 and 18, Mitchell teaches the the method and system of claim 5 and 17 above wherein the at least one view frame is a visible frame (column 5 lines 50-67 and column 11 lines 15-40).

17. In reference to claim 10 and 22, Doyle teaches the method of claim 8 and 20. Mitchell fails to explicitly teach wherein the at least one application-independent view-generating logic and controller logic frame serves as an application programming interface for developing views to be displayed in accordance with the application.

However, Doyle teaches a client accessing a portion of an application (document) from a server, with window panels and a Mosaic/External Application Program Interface (MEAPI) for developing views for display. Doyle discloses wherein the at least one application-independent view-generating logic and controller logic frame serves as an application programming interface for developing views to be displayed in accordance with the application (columns 12 and column 16 lines 9-40).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Mitchell by making window panels and a Mosaic/External Application Program Interface (MEAPI) for developing views for display as per the teachings of Doyle for accessing a portion of an application (document) from a server.

**18. Claims 7,11,19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,933) in view of Doyle et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,906) in view of Dresel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,170,019).**

19. In reference to claim 7 and 19, Mitchell in view of Doyle teach the the method and system of claim 5 and 17 above. They fail to teach wherein the at least one frame associated with the at least a subset of the model, the view-generating logic and the controller logic is not a visible frame. However, Dresel teaches hidden frames containing data and applications (column 5).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Mitchell by making at least one frame associated with the at least a subset of the model, the view-generating

Art Unit: 2157

logic and the controller logic a hidden frame as per the teachings of Dresel so that data can be stored and modified and used for updating the visible frame.

20. In reference to claim 11 and 23, Mitchell in view of Doyle teach the the method and system of claim 10 and 22 above wherein the views are implemented in accordance with the HyperText Markup Language. They fail to teach and the application programming interface is implemented in accordance with the JavaScript language.

However, Dresel teaches API's and applets written in JavaScript and Java language (columns 5 & 6).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Mitchell by making the application programming interface in JavaScript as per the teachings of Dresel so that online applications and functions can be added to internet sites.

#### ***Response to Amendment***

21. Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendments to claims 1,13 and 25 in the communication filed on 6/21/2004.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

22. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.



Art Unit: 2157

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramy M Osman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4008. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RMO  
November 4, 2004

  
ARIO ETIENNE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100